DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 862 SP 019 548

AUTHOR Clark, David L.; Amiot, Mary Anne
TITLE Opportunities for Schools of Education to Foster Practitioner Involvement in the Improvement of Teaching.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 30p.; For related document, see ED 213 663.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; Educational Improvement; Educational Research; *Governance; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Research Utilization; School Role; *Schools of Education; *Staff Development; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Participation; Technology Transfer

ABSTRACT

A review and analysis of a report on school practitioner involvement in improvement of educational practice is presented with additional inferences on the ability of schools of education to foster practitioner involvement. In the first section, research is reviewed in three areas of educational practice in which teachers may be involved: (1) knowledge production, or research and development; (2) knowledge utilization or dissemination; and (3) governance of and decision making about staff development programs. An assessment of the research findings concludes that there are more successful cases of teacher involvement with knowledge utilization than there are with knowledge production or planning of staff development programs. The second section examines factors that affect the involvement of schools of education with practitioners in improving teaching skills. In the conclusion, an assessment of the first section's research findings is discussed. Several factors inhibiting practitioner involvement in staff development are conceded, but a positive forecast for more practitioner involvement is made. Recommendations involve increasing teacher participation and activities among schools, colleges, and departments of education, federal and local education agencies, and teacher associations. Activities to promote practitioner involvement in knowledge dissemination and governance activities should be particularly emphasized in future collaborative programs. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
*. from the original document. *
****

ED214862

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION TO FOSTER PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

David L. Clark
Mary Anne Amiot

February 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David L. Clark
Mary Anne Amiot
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP019 548

INTRODUCTION

This paper extends the discussion of practitioner involvement in school improvement which was presented in John A. Emrick and Susan M. Peterson, School Practitioner Involvement in the Improvement of Practice: Review and Synthesis. The purposes of the extension are four-fold, i.e.:

- To review analytically the content of the Emrick and Peterson report;
- to relate the report to the higher education context, especially to schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs);
- to infer the implications of the report for school of education involvement with practitioners in particular school improvement activities;
- and, to serve as an advance organizer for SCDE personnel who are interested in examining the role of schools of education in increasing teacher involvement in school improvement activities.

Structurally the paper will begin with the analytic task. Emrick and Peterson have reviewed the literature about, and conducted case studies of, various strategies and tactics for involving practitioners in knowledge production (KP), knowledge utilization (KU), and governance and decision making activities. We will follow their tracks. In Section I, each of these topics will be re-visited and we will attempt to:

- Re-state the purposes which are asserted or implied by Emrick and Peterson for practitioner involvement in each area;
- compare the action models which they presented with the purposes;
- and, generate inferences and conclusions about the area and the requisite elements for successful practitioner involvement.

In the second section, we will review briefly some of the contextual and external impact factors which are likely to affect the ability of schools of education to foster practitioner involvement in KP, KU, and governance and decision making.* Finally, in Section III recommendations will be presented for enhancing the role of SCDEs in this arena.

* Governance and decision making is assigned a very specific definition in the Emrick and Peterson document. Despite the fact that research is reviewed on the general impact of practitioners' involvement in decision making, the actual discussion of models and programs is restricted chiefly to practitioner involvement in decision making about staff development programs. We will emphasize this substantive focus for collaborative decision making and, from here on, will refer to the three substantive areas as knowledge production, knowledge utilization, and staff development programs.

ANALYTIC REVIEW: PURPOSES AND MODELS OF PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Is it possible to involve school practitioners in research, in developing and spreading innovations, in building their own staff development programs? Is anyone doing it? To what end? Even if it is possible, is it desirable? or likely? Emrick and Peterson explored efforts which have been made to achieve such involvements and the rationale supporting these attempts. The following sub-sections review the Emrick-Peterson discussion.

Knowledge Production

The history of efforts to mount joint practitioner-researcher activities and/or to add the researcher's role to the practitioner's classic instructional function is longer than it is illustrious. The teacher as inquirer is a vision from John Dewey. The teacher as an action researcher is a venerable staff development proposal from the late 1940's. But the fact is that precious few teachers or administrators are now or have been involved with any regularity in educational R and D.

Purposes. Innovators who have imagined the practitioner as an active participant in R and D have proposed that this involvement might achieve one or more of the following ends:

1. To develop a positive attitude toward research--an interest in using the results of research to improve practice.
2. To improve the practitioner's instructional performance.
3. To increase the relevance of knowledge production in education.
4. To restructure and expand the role of the teacher as a fully functioning professional.

Models. Emrick and Peterson discussed six efforts that have been mounted to achieve these purposes*:

* One illustration, the Scottish Data Archives, was dropped from our analysis. This effort seemed to be a straight-forward knowledge utilization scheme--an attempt to make teachers aware of the existence of a body of data which they would find useful if it were accessed by them.

1. Action Research was not a single model but a movement. The concept was developed and disseminated by Max Corey (1948) and was designed to involve teachers in mounting and carrying out research in their own classrooms and schools.
2. The Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project was a project of The Far West Laboratory which used local R and D teams of teachers, researchers, and staff development specialists to investigate questions identified by teachers and to disseminate these findings to local colleagues.
3. The Teacher Collaborator Program provided practitioners with time away from their teaching assignments to work half-time with researchers at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching.
4. The Triangulation Model was an effort of the Ford Teaching Project to engage teachers in a particular form of action research in their own classrooms. The "triangulation" consisted of tape recordings of the teacher's classroom instruction by a member of the research team, tape recorded interviews with the teachers, and with their students.
5. The Prospect School and Archive Center is an effort to build a school around observation, documentation, and reflective conversations. The Prospect Archive is a self-generated data bank of children's writing, artifacts, teachers' records and classroom observation. In addition to the use of The Prospect procedures for improvement of the educational program at the School, the staff is involved in research projects with other agencies through consulting contracts. This form of teacher involvement represents a comprehensive organizational restructuring of the concept of a school.

These five models relate to the posited KP functions as pictured in Table I.

TABLE I

Functional Analysis of Model Programs for Practitioner Involvement in Knowledge Production

Models	Purposes or Functions: Develop Positive Attitude	Improve Instructional Performance	Increase Relevance of KP	Restructure the Teacher Role
1. Action Research	+	*	-	+
2. Interactive Research and Development on Teaching (Far West Laboratory)	+	*	*	-
3. Teacher Collaborator (Institute for Research on Teaching)	+	+	*	+
4. Triangulation Model (Ford Teaching Project)	+	*	-	+
5. Prospect School and Archive Center	+	*	+	*

Code:

* - Primary emphasis

+ - Ancillary emphasis

(-)- Incidental emphasis

The models almost uniformly emphasize, as a primary purpose, some form of staff development. Each is at least a vehicle for improving the teacher's attitude toward research and inquiry. The Far West Laboratory and Michigan State efforts appeared to attempt consciously to use the involvement to improve the knowledge production effort itself. The Prospect School is the only program which can be viewed as having a modified teacher role as its central emphasis.

Conclusions and Inferences. If this illustrates the range of efforts to involve practitioners in R and D, our guess is that the outlook for such involve-

ment is not promising. The models tend to support the proposition that these programs are possible but not feasible. Action research had limited dissemination. IRDT was tried at two sites with mixed results. The Collaborator program involves a small number of teachers at high cost. The Triangulation Model experienced marked failures along the way and, finally, was sustained by moving to an almost tutorial relationship between the researcher and the practitioner. The Prospect School is less a model for practitioner involvement in R and D than a model for restructuring American schools. We would conclude that:

1 - Involvement of practitioners in KP is possible but expensive in time and effort.

2 - Such programs probably have very positive staff development outcomes but they are likely to end up as tutorial efforts which touch few teachers.

3 - Action research was a promising idea which did not "take hold". Its more contemporary, successor models seem no more likely to be diffused widely.

Knowledge Utilization

Practioner involvement in knowledge utilization or dissemination programs has a long and somewhat more illustrious history than involvement in KP. The study council movement, for example, emerged at about the same time as action research but today there are 60-100 school study councils operating in the United States (National School Development Council, 1979). Recent Federal programs in dissemination explicitly support practitioner involvement in KU, e.g., National Diffusion Network.

Purposes. Advocates of involving practitioners actively in KU programs assert that such involvement will attain a variety of ends, i.e.:

1. To increase the practitioner's awareness of the existence of innovations which might address his/her problems--to expand information access for practitioners.
2. To improve the innovations themselves. Practitioner involvement ought to increase the relevancy, feasibility, and utility of innovative products or programs.
3. To increase the rate and number of adoptions and/or adaptations of innovations.
4. To improve the professional performance of educational practitioners by providing a rich staff development experience.
5. To effect positive organizational change in schools and school systems and to increase the capacity of the school to respond to future change requirements--a form of in situ organizational development.

Models. No case studies were conducted by Emrick and Peterson to demonstrate or assess efforts to involve practitioners in KU activities. But they reviewed three programs of practitioner involvement in KU for which secondary case descriptions were available, to wit:

1. The Pilot State Dissemination Program which employed a computerized information system at the state level and field agents to work with clients in accessing information from the system.
2. A teacher corps project (reported by Nolan & Roper, 1977) in which university-based personnel worked directly and intensively with an urban junior high school in an effort to bring the knowledge base in education to bear directly on practitioner's problems.
3. The National Diffusion Network which attempted to bring validated local innovations to practitioners through the linkage of the local disseminator-developer and a state facilitator.

Attention is also paid to conclusions drawn by such research and evaluation efforts as the Berman & McLaughlin (1977) national study of Federal programs supporting educational change and Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption Model of educational change. The three models which are discussed seem to relate to the various KU functions thusly:

TABLE II

Functional Analysis of Model Programs for Practitioner Involvement in Knowledge Utilization

Models	Purposes or Functions: Increase Awareness	Improve Quality of Innovations	Increase Adoptions	Improve Practitioner Performance	Effect Organizational Change
1. Pilot State Dissemination Program	*	-	-	+	-
2. Teacher Corps Project (Nolan & Roper)	-	-	*	-	+
3. National Diffusion Network	-	-	*	+	-

Code:

* - Primary emphasis

\+ - Ancillary emphasis

(-)- Incidental emphasis

These are obviously an incomplete set of models of practitioner involvement in KU but they do indicate that (a) there are successful instances of practitioner involvement in such programs and (b) up to this time the obvious diffusion-oriented functions, i.e., increasing awareness and adoptions, have probably dominated the purposes behind these programs. However, it is easy to argue the face validity of the other functions. Involving practitioners in efforts to invent and design solutions to operating problems could conceivably result in disseminable products

which are relevant, usable, practical, and of high legitimacy. The notion that both staff development and organizational development purposes could have synergistic relationships with diffusion-oriented functions seems very likely. Both PSDP and NDN planners would undoubtedly have argued that staff development was a natural fall-out from their program efforts.

Conclusions and Inferences. The Emrick and Peterson review of research on knowledge utilization and examination of collaborative KU models suggested several overarching generalizations:

1 - Person-to-person involvement is the key to success in KU activity. Even in relatively simple dissemination efforts which are designed to increase practitioners' awareness of innovations, it is likely that a linking agent will be required.

2 - There are no easy or inexpensive routes to effective knowledge diffusion and utilization. Practitioner trust in the credibility and legitimacy of innovations is low. The generalizability of innovations across organizations is suspect.

3 - Newer portrayals of the KU process picture adoption as a form of local adaptation which employs the innovation to invent an appropriate "local model" of the invention. Berman (1978) refers to this process as mutual adaptation or adaptive implementation.

4 - There is a paucity of incentives (and numerous disincentives) to encourage the educational practitioner to engage in searching out and adopting or adapting innovations. Involving the practitioner as a full participant in the KU process might highlight the necessity of providing such incentives.

5 - Researchers and evaluators working in this field seem to agree on a number of success elements necessary for KU programs:

- Some form of human linking agent.

- Concurrence of local gatekeepers in the process and product.
- Continuity of change agent or technical assistance contact.
- Combining research products with other sources of information for practitioners.
- Grounding change products and processes in the world of the practitioner, the ecology of the classroom.
- Staff training—frequently in process as well as product skills.
- Participant involvement in decision making.
- Freedom to adapt the innovation to local needs.

The state of the art knowledge base about educational dissemination, diffusion, and knowledge utilization seems to be coalescing around the necessity of personal interaction and local adaptation to effectively link KP and KU to effect school improvement. This suggests that any long-range strategy for dissemination in education should assume not only practitioner involvement in KU, but specific attention to linking the performers in the R and D and classroom worlds.

Governance and Decision Making in Staff Development

The final pattern of staff involvement examined by Emrick and Peterson was governance of and decision making about staff development programs—teacher control of professional development. Although the report discusses the literature surrounding the broader question of staff involvement in decision making and its relationship to job satisfaction, the cases presented concentrate on the more limited issue of governance of staff development. The San Jose case started as an example of broad development in instructional decision making but is now incorporated in a special emphasis on staff development as are the companion models.

While the previous two topics, i.e., KP and KU, may have introduced somewhat novel ideas about practitioner involvement, teacher participation in staff

development is supported aphoristically in the literature on inservice education; insisted upon by the organized teaching profession; and legitimated in Federal and state policies and programs, e.g., teacher centers, Teacher Corps.

Purposes. Practitioner involvement in decision making about staff development is argued to:

1. Elevate the status of the teacher by increasing professional autonomy.
2. Increase job satisfaction.
3. Improve the quality of the staff development experience itself and, therefore, improve the teacher's professional performance.
4. Reduce the professional isolation of the teacher within the classroom walls.

Models. Emrick and Peterson presented three case studies of staff development programs in which teachers were involved directly in governance and decision making.

1. The Akron/Kent State Teacher Corps Project involved the school, the community, and the university in a collaborative effort to design and implement a staff development program. In this instance, the scope of the teacher's control over decision making is left ambiguous but they were involved in the decision process. The program was [illegible]d-based and focused on practical problems faced by teachers. The program is argued to have adapted the "triangulation model" described in the KP section as a device for staff development. The adaptation was, in fact, very loose.
2. The McKinley Complex Teacher Corps Project assigned to teachers the responsibility for designing and implementing a program to fine-tune their instructional skills. Substantial emphasis was placed on personal interaction among the teacher participants.

3. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project was a broader effort to increase the participation of teachers in the development and management of instructional programs within their schools. This effort began as a part of the National Institute of Education Local Problem Solving Program and has now been incorporated as a part of a Teacher Corps Project. Sixteen school faculties eventually became involved in this comprehensive organizational development effort.

These models appear to us to relate to the earlier-stated functions as follows:

TABLE III

Functional Analysis of Model Programs for Practitioner Involvement in Governance and Decision Making About Staff Development

	Purposes or Functions			
Models	Elevate Teacher Status	Increase Job Satisfaction	Improve Staff Development Experiences	Reduce Professional Isolation
1. Akron/Kent State Teacher Crops Project	*	+	*	+
2. McKinley Complex Teacher Corps Project	-	+	*	*
3. San Jose Teacher Involvement Project	*	*	+	+

Code:

* - Primary emphasis

+ - Ancillary emphasis

(-)- Incidental emphasis

This is the most difficult set of models to discuss because of the lack of clarity about the breadth of the topic which Emrick and Peterson are covering. The San Jose Project was a comprehensive organizational development effort which involved teachers and their local education associations in some decision making about instruction in their schools. The Akron and McKinley projects

were clearly narrower in scope involving participatory activity in designing staff development programs for teachers. None of these models confront the basic issues revolving around teacher involvement in school governance and decision making within the school bureaucracy and/or through their professional associations or unions as a co-equal power force dealing with the bureaucracy.

To clarify the issue, at least from our own point of view, we have chosen to delimit the topic to practitioner involvement in staff development which seems to be the primary focus of the Teacher Corps models.

Conclusions and Inferences. As noted earlier, practitioner involvement in staff development programs is now accepted almost routinely in the literature, in public policy and programs, and certainly in the opinion of teachers. In fact, however, most teachers are probably still involved primarily in staff development through formal courses to meet certification or degree requirements and the elements requisite to attaining success in participatory programs are still difficult to achieve. Emrick and Peterson enumerated these elements in their three models as follows:

- Extended period of pre-project planning.
- Clearly defined boundaries of collaborative activity.
- Teacher choice about participation.
- Involvement of and support from building and district administrators.
- Opportunities to build group cohesion.
- A flexible, adaptive action plan.
- A plan sensitive to local needs and problems.
- Skill development training for participants in communication and decision-making.

Conclusions

Emrick and Peterson reviewed the research and evaluative literature and examined selected instances of practitioner involvement in KP, KU, and staff development

programs. An assessment of their findings lead us to conclude that:

- Successful involvement of practitioners in KP activities is hard to document. If they are involved, the function most likely to be achieved is staff development.
- There are a variety of instances of successful teacher involvement in knowledge utilization programs. With the increasing evidence about the necessity of person-to-person contact for effective dissemination, this ought to be a burgeoning area of joint practitioner-disseminator activity.
- Teacher involvement in decision making about and planning for staff development programs is so well supported in the evaluation of such efforts that it is now considered almost axiomatic. However, in practice most programs are not jointly planned and governed and the implementation problems surrounding these programs are still substantial.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION WITH PRACTITIONERS IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING*

Schools of education are not newcomers to the proposition that practitioner involvement in KU, KP, and staff development might have positive effects on the improvement of education. Max Corey initiated the action research movement from his professorial base at Teachers College, Columbia University, thirty years ago. School study councils and leagues of schools invented by and affiliated with SCDEs have attempted to employ research, diffusion, and training in various combinations to effect school improvement; and it was frequently the case that the councils and leagues were governed by policy boards of practitioners, albeit usually chief school administrators rather than teachers. Bureaus of field service were a response to the demands of practitioners for service--again, however, the demand almost always originated with school boards or administrators and dealt with administrative operations and concerns. Schools of education proselytized for the use of needs surveys with practitioners. From time-to-time SCDEs have engaged in jointly determined in-service education arrangements with teachers and administrators. Recently, of course, they have become more directly involved with practitioners in jointly governed in-service education activities through such national programs as the Teacher Corps and the Teacher Center Program and through state and locally sponsored teacher centers. In several states, e.g., Texas and Florida, school of education involvement with local schools and teachers through teacher centers is a matter of state educational policy.

* This section of the paper draws heavily upon a national study of schools of education, i.e., David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, A Study of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers, and Change Agencies (Indiana University: Bloomington, Indiana), National Institute of Education Project No. 4-0752, April 1977, and a follow-up study, i.e., Linda S. Lotto and David L. Clark, Educational Knowledge Dissemination and Utilization: An Assessment of Current and Potential Capacity of Schools of Education with Recommendations for Federal Support Strategies (Far West Laboratory: San Francisco), June, 1978.

SCDE Capacity for Involvement

Schools of education are already invested in KP, KU, and staff development. A brief review of their level of involvement in these broad function areas will provide guidance as to whether or not it is sensible to imagine that they could participate in and foster joint programs with practitioners.

Institutional capacity. Over 200 SCDEs express a mission commitment to KU; roughly 100 attempt to function as producers of research; circa 670 operate instructional programs at the fifth year level, i.e., in-service programs for educational personnel which are a form of staff development. Most of the doctoral level SCDEs sponsor knowledge production and utilization (KPU) and staff development programs, reward their personnel for involvement in these efforts, and release personnel time to encourage them to participate in these ventures. Overall, SCDE personnel account for 65 percent of the research journal articles in education and 53 percent of the articles in practitioner journals (Clark & Guba, p. V-50).

Center and bureau capacity. Over 500 specialized centers or bureaus have been set up by SCDEs to foster KPU efforts, e.g., bureaus of research, field service units, school study councils, teacher centers, etc. Substantial local budgetary provisions are made by schools of education to support these units and they are staffed typically by SCDE faculty (Lotto & Clark, p. 32).

Individual capacity. There are over 30,000 faculty members working in the masters and doctoral level SCDEs in the United States. The majority of these faculty are engaged currently in ad hoc or institutionally sponsored arrangements with public schools. A significant number (circa 10% - 15%) are regular producers in KP. A large percentage are involved in in-service training programs for school faculty at the post-baccalaureate level.

This concentration of effort by SCDEs appears to be substantial, however, before becoming too enthusiastic about the capacity of schools of education in KP,

KU, and staff development a few demurs are in order:

- Almost all the KP activity is cut off from practitioner involvement. Most university-based researchers view practitioners as subjects for inquiry or gate-keepers of subjects for inquiry but not partners in inquiry.

- SCDE involvement in KU activity has had a checkered history. Schools of education were early entrants in the field but many of their efforts cast the practitioner in a passive role as the target for change. Few viewed them as a partner in KU activity. Many recent Federal programs in dissemination and diffusion have frustrated and discouraged the participation of SCDEs in KU, e.g., State Capacity Building Program, National Diffusion Network, Teacher Centers, RDx. This policy level disinterest in SCDEs undoubtedly reflects a lack of confidence in the output of their earlier KU activities.

- Schools of education have been scored, probably with justification, about the quality of many of their staff development programs. Surely it was the case that master's level fifth year programs were designed for the most part to meet certification standards and graduate school requirements rather than the needs of classroom personnel. Teacher involvement in planning in-service experiences was minimal. Recently, SCDEs have begun to work more closely with school systems, teacher associations, and with and through teacher centers in planning staff development work for teachers.

Facilitating and Inhibiting Factors

In many ways this is a propitious time to challenge schools of education to work directly with educational practitioners in KU, KP, and staff development. Several current conditions would encourage SCDEs to "mend their ways", i.e., a) many of their classical patterns of interactions with schools have been criticized sharply, b) their undergraduate and graduate enrollments have declined, and c) they are casting about for some new roles and clientele.

In considering what SCDEs might do and how they might do it the planner must recognize that these institutions share some contextual features and are being impacted upon by some external factors which will influence their organizational response. In Table IV, we have attempted to note a few major factors and how these factors might serve as facilitators or inhibitors to SCDE activity in joint KP, KU, and staff development programs with practitioners. Whether you are an SCDE administrator or faculty member responsible for fostering joint involvement with schools, or an external change agent hoping to encourage such joint efforts, the SCDE context is one determinant of likely success. In the following three sub-sections we will describe briefly the factors by program activity. Table IV illustrates the facilitating and inhibiting factors affecting SCDE involvement with practitioners in KP, KU, and staff development.

Knowledge production.* There is little evidence from the SCDE viewpoint that joint researcher-practitioner programs in KP will grow in number. Declining fiscal support is encouraging SCDEs to look at new ventures for new dollars but it also cuts down on their risk taking behavior (this is a new, high risk activity) and reduces the fiscal and personnel slack needed to mount new programs. The idiographic culture of SCDEs makes it difficult to sustain inter-agency arrangements of any sort. KP activity is valued in academe above all other function areas but practitioner involvement will taint rather than enhance the prestige of KP projects. Professors are not well rewarded for service activities or field involvement. Linking KP to field involvement will appear to some within the university to be overemphasizing service at the expense of research.

Are there counter balancing factors? A few but probably not enough to offset the negatives. SCDEs are "under the gun". If an outside agency were to pay

* These descriptions are grossly over-simplified. SCDEs come in all types and sizes from major research producing doctoral level universities to small colleges which maintain a teacher certification program at the baccalaureate level. We are thinking chiefly of SCDEs with graduate programs and the circa 200 of these institutions which have maintained past involvement with local education agencies (LEAs).

TABLE IV

An Inventory of Factors Affecting SCDE Involvement With Practitioners in KU, KP, and Staff Development Activities

Factors	Type of Program Activity: Knowledge Production	Knowledge Utilization	Staff Development
1. Declining fiscal support	-	+ and -	+
2. Idiographic culture of SCDEs	-	-	-
3. Faculty released time for KP and KU	+	+	-
4. Pre-eminence of KP in reward structure	-	-	-
5. Historical commitment to "service" activity	-	+	+
6. Vulnerability to outside pressures for change	+	+	+
7. Declining student enrollments	-	-	+
8. Continued state/federal interest in linking the knowledge base with practice	-	+	+
9. Low status of service in reward structure	-	-	-
10. Role of faculty member as "expert"	-	- and +	- and +
11. Practitioner perception of past SCDE performance in KU and staff development	- and +	-	-
12. Ease and frequency with which SCDEs adopt new missions	+	+	+
13. Land grant concept of service (especially in public SCDEs)	+	+	+
14. Tradition of ad hoc consulting service by SCDE faculty	-	- and +	-
15. Emergence of competitive agencies in KP, KU, and training functions	+	+	+

Code:

+ - Chiefly a facilitating factor

(-)- Chiefly an inhibiting factor

(-) and + - Mixed factor

for an action research program, it is probable that many schools of education would try to work on it. Schools of education have a tradition of service which exceeds the service emphasis in the general university climate and many larger SCDEs are housed in state colleges and universities with "land grant" service emphases. There are some funds available in SCDEs for research activity through the released time of faculty to work in this function area. Few other educational organizations have this advantage. Schools of education seem to be porous organizations, i.e., they are vulnerable to outside pressures and relatively flexible about taking on new missions.

However, on balance we would guess that SCDEs would be reluctant partners in joint KP projects with practitioners. The exception would seem to be a form of action research. In that case, the joint program would actually be a staff development undertaking and the research aspect of the program would be incidental. Research-like techniques would simply be employed as handmaidens to attain staff development ends. If this could be funded, it would be a "natural" function for the SCDE and the biggest roadblock would be overcoming the negative perceptions held by practitioners about SCDE training ventures.

Knowledge utilization. Despite the fact that SCDEs have been excluded from a number of recent federally-supported initiatives in KU (for example, the National Diffusion Network) this is an area of long-standing interest in which many institutional factors would indicate that schools of education could participate effectively with LEA partners. SCDEs do need to extend their support base. They can redeploy some faculty released time for this purpose and the role fits their institutional commitment to service. There is a cadre of trained personnel available within SCDEs since many faculty have worked in KU activities with LEAs on an individual basis even when they have not been involved in institutional programs.

There are, of course, factors with negative valence. Some faculty will resist involvement because service is less richly rewarded in institutions of higher edu-

cation (IHEs) than research. Any joint program is hard to sustain because of the idiographic culture of these institutions. Practitioners, especially classroom teachers, have criticized past school of education programs in D and U as not being attuned to their needs. The professor as "expert" is suspect in joint arrangements.

The best prediction of what an organization can do is what it has done. Schools of education have worked jointly with LEAs in knowledge sharing and utilization programs. They should be able to expand this involvement and serve as a stimulator for practitioner involvement in KU.

Staff development. On no count has the SCDE been excoriated so sharply as the effectiveness of their in-service training efforts. That is hardly surprising since, in contrast with KP and KU, teaching is the SCDEs primary function area and the activity most visible to the chief critics, i.e., the practitioner. In addition to whatever legitimate ineptness has occurred in SCDE staff development programs, there have also been political explanations for the criticisms since SCDEs and the organized teaching profession are contesting for the key role in controlling the preparation for and entry to the teaching profession.

The negative view of the past involvement of schools of education in staff development is the critical inhibiting factor to the emergence of staff development programs in which the practitioners play joint governance roles with IHE partners. Unfortunately, professorial personnel accentuate this difficulty by holding on to the "expert" role and attempting to define the SCDE as the first among equals in any partnership arrangement.

However, such jointly governed staff development programs are growing, will expand, and will involve both LEA and SCDE participants in institutionally sanctioned arrangements. Teacher centers and Teacher Corps have demonstrated that such programs can work effectively. Schools of education need these clientele. To be dealt out of the staff development function would be to strike at the heart of the SCDE line

function. Schools of education will find a way to foster such mutual involvement--they are already about that task.

CONCLUSION

Emrick and Peterson concluded by noting that the future for the concept of practitioner involvement in KP, KU, and staff development is "uncertain"; more specifically that, ". . . general increases in practitioner involvement will be unlikely, or at best very slow in emerging" (p. 100). They arrived at this pessimistic assessment because they argued:

1. "The active involvement of practitioners in most educational deliberations is simply not within current educational norms" (p.100).
2. The knowledge base needed by practitioners for effective participation is just emerging.
3. Practitioners are reluctant participators--hesitant to assume the extra work involved in the participation.
4. The hard-to-achieve enabling conditions, the typically slow progress, and the relatively intangible benefits characteristic of programs of practitioner involvement will require an unusual (and, obviously, unexpected) commitment by stakeholders.

Thus, despite the many advantages of participation noted by Emrick and Peterson they anticipated, ". . . major difficulties in accomplishing rapid progress in so basic a reform" (p. 103).

We concede the foregoing factors which inhibit practitioner involvement but conclude that:

- Practitioner involvement in knowledge utilization and staff development is an idea whose time has come. The next decade in education will show a rapid increase in practitioner involvement in such programs. Individuals and institutions that recognize and capitalize on this trend will expand markedly their leadership possibities in the field.

Unsurprisingly, then, that leads us to our first general recommendation for schools of educations, i.e.:

Recommendation #1 • Administrators and faculty in schools of education should expand and/or initiate joint efforts with practitioners in the functions of dissemination and staff development.

Before turning to a few implementing recommendations, we should back up and state the conditions which encouraged us to disagree with Emrick and Peterson, to wit:

1. Programs of practitioner involvement are working and are being assessed positively by participants, e.g., NDN, Teacher Corps, teacher centers. The best predictions of what will happen are based on what is happening and has happened. The idea of practitioner involvement, as Emrick and Peterson demonstrated, is a good idea. More importantly it is in the process of being diffused.
2. Practitioner involvement is already institutionalized in the field through the Federal and state programs of support which, in many programs, mandate such involvement.
3. The idea "fits" the aspirations of the organized teaching profession for self-determination. Equally importantly, it fits the aspirations of people in our society generally for openness, participation, and self-determination.

Our guess is that these broader considerations will overcome the difficulties noted by Emrick and Peterson and that the flow toward increased practitioner involvement will be steady and swift.

As we noted in our first recommendation, we think that SCDEs should be an active partner in this movement. Unquestionably such organizational involvement would assist schools of education as they attempt to expand their functions during this period of recession in higher education. More convincing to us, is the fact that (a) SCDEs possess resources which can be used effectively to improve such programs

and (b) the continued leadership of SCDEs in education is dependent upon their effective involvement with educational practitioners. However, as we turn to more specific recommendations, it will be apparent that we would differentiate among the functions for which the involvement is intended, i.e.:

Recommendation #2 • Schools of education should de-emphasize any proposed efforts to involve practitioners as partners in R and D activities. Past efforts have demonstrated that these are high risk, low yield programs. If they are initiated, they should be set up to serve staff development ends and the practitioner-participants should be released from their teaching responsibilities during the program period.

On the other hand, it seems apparent that the future for SCDEs in in-service education lies in joint staff development programs. We would suggest that:

Recommendation #3 • Schools of education expand their efforts to link practitioners directly into the governance and decision making structures of programs of staff development. This implies to us that the school of education faculty and administration should work to accomplish this end with the LEA school board and administration, the local teacher's association, and, where appropriate, an existing teacher center or individual teachers. The pattern of joint decision making will have to reflect the experience of past cooperative efforts and the particular form of governance which fits the SCDE and LEA(s) involved.

Successful SCDE participation in staff development rests not only with the school of education but with local and national decision makers. In support of the previous recommendation we suggest to these groups that:

Recommendation 3a • LEAs, local teacher associations, and operating teacher centers extend the same professional courtesy to SCDEs which they expect from them. Firstly, that they recognize the training

capacity which exists in these organizations and try to tap into it as partners in staff development. Secondly, that they work with the SCDE administration and faculty as an organization rather than simply negotiating an ad hoc arrangement with an individual faculty member for a specific service. The latter tactic will serve the short term need but will not build up the capacity of the SCDE as a long term resource center. SCDEs need to build up their organizational staff development capacity just as LEAs feel the need to extend their problem solving capacity as organizations.

Recommendation 3b • National planners in Federal agencies and foundations should strive to use the training capacity of SCDEs in supporting staff development efforts in local school districts. All the evidence points to the fact that schools of education possess and could expand their capacity as effective staff developers. They should be encouraged to do so by enlightened national policies which are directed toward strengthening the capacity of the school system as a whole.

The training function is so "natural" to the college and university that few persons would debate the efficacy of its involvement in that function area. In education, the service or knowledge utilization function has an almost equally venerable history. We recommend that:

Recommendation #4 • SCDEs continue to emphasize knowledge utilization activities in their programs and that they work specifically to increase the involvement of practitioners in these programs.

Schools of education might be admonished to wipe out any conceptual vestiges of KU or dissemination as a one-way street and to eliminate over-reliance on administrator involvement in planning and governing KU activities. Two enabling groups could also

be encouraged to modify their past practices to facilitate SCDE activity in this area, to wit:

Recommendation 4a • College and university-level administrators should attempt to adjust promotion, tenure, and salary criteria to reflect the particular responsibility of SCDEs to work with practitioners in the field on operating problems of schools and school districts.

Recommendation 4b • National planners should build upon existing school of education resources in designing and supporting dissemination and KU programs for LEAs.

Summary

We expect continued and rapid growth of staff development and knowledge utilization programs in education that involve practitioners in governance and daily operations. We do not anticipate the spread of practitioner involvement in educational R and D.

In the former instances, we think the programs will be stronger if schools of education become partners in these ventures. Concomitantly, we would expect schools of education to become better through their participation and to then become more effective partners in subsequent programs. We encourage schools of education to expand their joint staff development and KU activities with practitioners. We encourage LEAs and national planners to consider and use this organizational resource in their expanded KU and staff development programs.

REFERENCES

Berman, P. Designing Implementation to Match Policy Situations: A Contingency Analysis of Programmed and Adaptive Implementation. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1978.

Clark, D. L. & Guba, E. G. A Study of Teacher Education Institutions As Innovators, Knowledge Producers, and Change Agencies. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1977.

Corey, S. M. "Action Research, Fundamental Research and Educational Practices." Teachers College Record, 1948, 50, 509-514.

Emrick, J. A. & Peterson, S. M. School Practitioner Involvement in the Improvement of Practice: Review and Synthesis. Los Altos, CA: J. A. Emrick & Associates, 1980.

Lotto, L. S. & Clark, D. L. An Assessment of Current and Potential Capacity of Schools of Education with Recommendations for Federal Support Strategies. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory, 1978.

National School Development Council. School Study Councils in The United States. Framingham, MA: The Author, 1979.